



JENNIFER M. GRAMHOLM  
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
LANSING



THOMAS D. WATKINS, JR.  
SUPERINTENDENT OF  
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

April 30, 2003

The Honorable Rod Paige  
Secretary of Education  
United States Department of Education  
400 Maryland Avenue  
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dear Secretary Paige,

Michigan is pleased to transmit the enclosed revised version of its Consolidated State Application for State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110).

We thank staff from the U.S. Department of Education for their assistance and their patience in helping Michigan complete this application in a timely manner.

Sincerely,

Thomas D. Watkins, Jr.

Enclosure

**STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

KATHLEEN N. STRAUS – PRESIDENT • SHARON L. GIRE – VICE PRESIDENT  
CAROLYN L. CURTIN – SECRETARY • HERBERT S. MOYER – TREASURER  
MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – NASBE DELEGATE • JOHN C. AUSTIN • ELIZABETH W. BAUER • EILEEN LAPPIN WEISER

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909  
[www.michigan.gov](http://www.michigan.gov) • (517) 373-3324

# **Consolidated State Application May 1, 2003 Submission**

**for State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and  
Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110)**

**Due: May 1, 2003**



**U. S. Department of Education  
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education  
Washington, D.C. 20202**

## **Instructions for Completing the Consolidated State Application May 1, 2003, Submission**

As described in the May 7, 2002, Consolidated State Application Package, States' submissions of their consolidated applications have been divided into multiple submissions and information requests. The information States are to provide in their May 1, 2003, consolidated applications is listed below. This list differs from the list in the Consolidated State Application form distributed in 2002 in that it excludes (1) the information that States were required to submit in their January 31, 2003, Accountability Workbooks, (2) the information States are to provide for Goal 5 (All students will graduate from high school), and (3) the information States are to provide regarding their objectives for student development and attainment of English proficiency. It also corrects an error in the application package. The 2002 application package indicated that performance targets for non-AYP indicators would be due in May 2003. It should have stated that both targets and baseline data for non-AYP indicators would be due in September 2003.

(1) Accountability Workbooks. States are expected to submit any outstanding accountability workbook information at the time and in the manner previously established by the Department.

(2) Goal 5 baseline data and targets. The Department is considering publishing an amendment to the Consolidated State Application regulations to require States to use the same definition for graduation rate that has been approved by the Department as part of the State's Accountability Plan under Title I, Part A of the ESEA. Therefore the submission date for baseline data and targets for Goal 5 is changed from May to September 2003.

(3) English Proficiency Objectives. Since many States have indicated that they will not have objectives related to student development and attainment of English proficiency by May, the Department is deferring submission of the objectives until September 2003.

### **Summary of Information Required for May 1, 2003 Submission**

#### **A. ESEA GOALS, ESEA INDICATORS, STATE PERFORMANCE TARGETS**

1. Baseline data and performance targets for the following AYP - related indicators.

Performance Goal 1: By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum by attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

- 1.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of students, in the aggregate and for each subgroup, who are at or above the proficient level in reading/language arts on the State's assessment, consistent with the State's annual measurable objectives. (Note: These subgroups are those

for which the ESEA requires State reporting, as identified in section 1111(h)(1)(c)(i).)

- 1.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of students, in the aggregate and in each subgroup, who are at or above the proficient level in mathematics on the State's assessment, consistent with the State's annual measurable objectives. (Note: These subgroups are those for which the ESEA requires State reporting, as identified in section 1111(h)(1)(c)(i).)
- 1.3 Performance indicator: The percentage of Title I schools that make adequate yearly progress.

Performance Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

- 2.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students who are at or above the proficient level in reading/language arts on the State's assessment, as reported for performance indicator 1.1.
- 2.3 Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students who are at or above the proficient level in mathematics on the State's assessment, as reported for performance indicator 1.2.

**Baseline data and performance targets for all ESEA Goals and indicators not included in this May 1, 2003, submission will be due on September 1, 2003.**

2. Baseline data and performance targets for any State identified goals and indicators.

## **B. STATE ACTIVITIES TO IMPLEMENT ESEA PROGRAMS**

Consistent with the consolidated State Application Package distributed in Spring 2002, States are asked to submit the following information by May 1, 2003:

- 1a. Evidence that the State has:

- adopted challenging content standards in reading/language arts and mathematics at each grade level for grades 3 through 8, consistent with section 1111(b)(1); or
- disseminated grade-level expectations for reading/language arts and mathematics for grades 3 through 8 to LEAs and schools if the State's academic content standards cover more than one grade level.

- 1b. Detailed timeline for major milestones for adopting challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).

1c. A detailed timeline of major milestones for the development and implementation, in consultation with LEAs, of assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels.

1d. A detailed timeline for major milestones for setting, in consultation with LEAs, academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).

This workbook format has been developed to facilitate preparation and submission of the information required in this May 1 submission. States may use this format or another format of their choosing provided that all required information is provided in a clear and concise manner. The deadline for submission of this application is May 1, 2003.

## **Transmittal Instructions**

To expedite the receipt of this May 1, 2003, Consolidated State Application submission, please send your submission via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Send electronic submissions to [conapp@ed.gov](mailto:conapp@ed.gov).

A State that submits only a paper submission should mail the submission by express courier to:

Celia Sims  
U.S. Department of Education  
400 Maryland Ave., SW  
Room 3W300  
Washington, D.C. 20202-6400  
(202) 401-0113

**A. ESEA GOALS, ESEA INDICATORS, STATE PERFORMANCE TARGETS**

Baseline Data for Performance Indicators 1.1, 1.2, 2.2, and 2.3

In the following charts, please provide baseline data from the 2001-2002 school year test administration. Charts have been provided for each of grades 3 through 8 and high school to accommodate the varied State assessment systems in mathematics and reading/language arts during the 2001-2002 school year. States should provide baseline data on the percentage of students scoring at the proficient or advanced levels for those grades in which the State administered mathematics and reading/language arts assessments during 2001-2002.

**BASELINE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA: GRADE 3**

<b>Grade 3 Math</b>	<b>Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced</b>
<b>Student Group</b>	<b>01-02 Baseline</b>
All Students	Not applicable
African American/Black	
American Indian/Native Alaskan	
Asian/Pacific Islander	
Hispanic	
White	
Other	
Students with Disabilities	
Students without Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	
Female	

<b>Grade 3 Reading/Language Arts</b>	<b>Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced</b>
<b>Student Group</b>	<b>01-02 Baseline</b>
All Students	Not applicable
African American/Black	
American Indian/Native Alaskan	
Asian/Pacific Islander	
Hispanic	
White	
Other	
Students with Disabilities	
Students without Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	
Female	



**BASELINE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA: GRADE 4**

<b>Grade 4 Math</b>	<b>Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced</b>
<b>Student Group</b>	<b>01-02 Baseline</b>
All Students	56.4%
African American/Black	42.1%
American Indian/Native Alaskan	57.4%
Asian/Pacific Islander	76.4%
Hispanic	47.6%
White	72.4%
Other	60.6%
Students with Disabilities	33.0%
Students without Disabilities	57.4%
Limited English Proficient	51.1%
Economically Disadvantaged	48.2%
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	58.3%
Migrant	36.0%
Male	66.4%
Female	51.0%

<b>Grade 4 Reading/Language Arts</b>	<b>Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced</b>
<b>Student Group</b>	<b>01-02 Baseline</b>
All Students	56.4%
African American/Black	31.8%
American Indian/Native Alaskan	49.1%
Asian/Pacific Islander	60.4%
Hispanic	36.1%
White	64.0%
Other	53.8%
Students with Disabilities	28.4%
Students without Disabilities	58.7%
Limited English Proficient	34.3%
Economically Disadvantaged	38.3%
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	62.8%
Migrant	29.0%
Male	54.4%
Female	56.5%

**BASELINE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA: GRADE 5**

<b>Grade 5 Math</b>	<b>Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced</b>
<b>Student Group</b>	<b>01-02 Baseline</b>
All Students	Not applicable
African American/Black	
American Indian/Native Alaskan	
Asian/Pacific Islander	
Hispanic	
White	
Other	
Students with Disabilities	
Students without Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	
Female	

<b>Grade 5 Reading/Language Arts</b>	<b>Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced</b>
<b>Student Group</b>	<b>01-02 Baseline</b>
All Students	Not applicable
African American/Black	
American Indian/Native Alaskan	
Asian/Pacific Islander	
Hispanic	
White	
Other	
Students with Disabilities	
Students without Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	
Female	

**BASELINE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA: GRADE 6**

<b>Grade 6 Math</b>	<b>Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced</b>
<b>Student Group</b>	<b>01-02 Baseline</b>
All Students	Not applicable
African American/Black	
American Indian/Native Alaskan	
Asian/Pacific Islander	
Hispanic	
White	
Other	
Students with Disabilities	
Students without Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	
Female	

<b>Grade 6 Reading/Language Arts</b>	<b>Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced</b>
<b>Student Group</b>	<b>01-02 Baseline</b>
All Students	Not applicable
African American/Black	
American Indian/Native Alaskan	
Asian/Pacific Islander	
Hispanic	
White	
Other	
Students with Disabilities	
Students without Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	
Female	

**BASELINE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA: GRADE 7**

<b>Grade 7 Math</b>	<b>Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced</b>
<b>Student Group</b>	<b>01-02 Baseline</b>
All Students	Not applicable
African American/Black	
American Indian/Native Alaskan	
Asian/Pacific Islander	
Hispanic	
White	
Other	
Students with Disabilities	
Students without Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	
Female	

<b>Grade 7 Reading/Language Arts</b>	<b>Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced</b>
<b>Student Group</b>	<b>01-02 Baseline</b>
All Students	50.8%
African American/Black	23.3%
American Indian/Native Alaskan	39.5%
Asian/Pacific Islander	59.0%
Hispanic	35.1%
White	59.5%
Other	45.0%
Students with Disabilities	22.2%
Students without Disabilities	52.6%
Limited English Proficient	34.3%
Economically Disadvantaged	29.3%
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	56.5%
Migrant	23.4%
Male	50.5%
Female	51.5%

**BASELINE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA: GRADE 8**

<b>Grade 8 Math</b>	<b>Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced</b>
<b>Student Group</b>	<b>01-02 Baseline</b>
All Students	54.0%
African American/Black	21.1%
American Indian/Native Alaskan	37.9%
Asian/Pacific Islander	68.8%
Hispanic	35.5%
White	62.9%
Other	45.9%
Students with Disabilities	15.3%
Students without Disabilities	57.0%
Limited English Proficient	39.8%
Economically Disadvantaged	29.0%
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	59.6%
Migrant	27.0%
Male	54.8%
Female	53.3%

<b>Grade 8 Reading/Language Arts</b>	<b>Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced</b>
<b>Student Group</b>	<b>01-02 Baseline</b>
All Students	Not applicable
African American/Black	
American Indian/Native Alaskan	
Asian/Pacific Islander	
Hispanic	
White	
Other	
Students with Disabilities	
Students without Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	
Female	

**BASELINE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA: HIGH SCHOOL**

<b>High School Math</b>	<b>Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced</b>
<b>Student Group</b>	<b>01-02 Baseline</b>
All Students	62.3 %
African American/Black	28.3 %
American Indian/Native Alaskan	47.7 %
Asian/Pacific Islander	70.4 %
Hispanic	47.3 %
White	70.1 %
Other	45.2 %
Students with Disabilities	%
Students without Disabilities	%
Limited English Proficient	%
Economically Disadvantaged	%
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	%
Migrant	%
Male	62.6 %
Female	62.6 %

<b>High School Reading/Language Arts</b>	<b>Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced</b>
<b>Student Group</b>	<b>01-02 Baseline</b>
All Students	54.7 %
African American/Black	17.8 %
American Indian/Native Alaskan	38.3 %
Asian/Pacific Islander	59.7 %
Hispanic	36.9 %
White	63.0 %
Other	43.6 %
Students with Disabilities	%
Students without Disabilities	%
Limited English Proficient	%
Economically Disadvantaged	%
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	%
Migrant	%
Male	56.7 %
Female	53.3 %

Performance Targets for Performance Indicators 1.1, 1.2, 2.2, and 2.3

In the following charts, please provide performance targets for the percentage of students who will be at or above the proficient level in mathematics and reading/language arts on the State's assessment, consistent with the State's annual measurable objectives. Three sets of charts have been provided to accommodate States' varying plans for setting annual measurable objectives, with some States having the same annual measurable objectives for all grade levels in the State and other States having separate annual measurable objectives for elementary, middle, and high schools. At the top of each set of charts, please indicate the grades levels to which your annual measurable objectives apply.

**STATE PERFORMANCE TARGETS (ANNUAL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES)**

GRADES: \_\_\_\_\_3,4,5\_\_\_\_\_

<b>Math</b>	<b>Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced</b>
2002-2003 Target	<b>47%</b>
2003-2004 Target	<b>47%</b>
2004-2005 Target	<b>56%</b>
2005-2006 Target	<b>56%</b>
2006-2007 Target	<b>56%</b>
2007-2008 Target	<b>65%</b>
2008-2009 Target	<b>65%</b>
2009-2010 Target	<b>65%</b>
2010-2011 Target	<b>74%</b>
2011-2012 Target	<b>82%</b>
2012-2013 Target	<b>91%</b>
2013-2014 Target	<b>100%</b>

<b>Reading/Language Arts</b>	<b>Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced</b>
2002-2003 Target	<b>38%</b>
2003-2004 Target	<b>38%</b>
2004-2005 Target	<b>48%</b>
2005-2006 Target	<b>48%</b>
2006-2007 Target	<b>48%</b>
2007-2008 Target	<b>59%</b>
2008-2009 Target	<b>59%</b>
2009-2010 Target	<b>59%</b>
2010-2011 Target	<b>69%</b>
2011-2012 Target	<b>79%</b>
2012-2013 Target	<b>90%</b>
2013-2014 Target	<b>100%</b>



**STATE PERFORMANCE TARGETS (ANNUAL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES)**

GRADES: \_\_\_\_\_6,7,8\_\_\_\_\_

<b>Math</b>	<b>Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced</b>
2002-2003 Target	<b>31%</b>
2003-2004 Target	<b>31%</b>
2004-2005 Target	<b>43%</b>
2005-2006 Target	<b>43%</b>
2006-2007 Target	<b>43%</b>
2007-2008 Target	<b>54%</b>
2008-2009 Target	<b>54%</b>
2009-2010 Target	<b>54%</b>
2010-2011 Target	<b>66%</b>
2011-2012 Target	<b>77%</b>
2012-2013 Target	<b>89%</b>
2013-2014 Target	<b>100%</b>

<b>Reading/Language Arts</b>	<b>Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced</b>
2002-2003 Target	<b>31%</b>
2003-2004 Target	<b>31%</b>
2004-2005 Target	<b>43%</b>
2005-2006 Target	<b>43%</b>
2006-2007 Target	<b>43%</b>
2007-2008 Target	<b>54%</b>
2008-2009 Target	<b>54%</b>
2009-2010 Target	<b>54%</b>
2010-2011 Target	<b>66%</b>
2011-2012 Target	<b>77%</b>
2012-2013 Target	<b>89%</b>
2013-2014 Target	<b>100%</b>

**STATE PERFORMANCE TARGETS (ANNUAL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES)**

GRADES: \_\_\_\_\_9-12\_\_\_\_\_

<b>Math</b>	<b>Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced</b>
2002-2003 Target	<b>33%</b>
2003-2004 Target	<b>33%</b>
2004-2005 Target	<b>44%</b>
2005-2006 Target	<b>44%</b>
2006-2007 Target	<b>44%</b>
2007-2008 Target	<b>55%</b>
2008-2009 Target	<b>55%</b>
2009-2010 Target	<b>55%</b>
2010-2011 Target	<b>67%</b>
2011-2012 Target	<b>78%</b>
2012-2013 Target	<b>89%</b>
2013-2014 Target	<b>100%</b>

<b>Reading/Language Arts</b>	<b>Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced</b>
2002-2003 Target	<b>42%</b>
2003-2004 Target	<b>42%</b>
2004-2005 Target	<b>52%</b>
2005-2006 Target	<b>52%</b>
2006-2007 Target	<b>52%</b>
2007-2008 Target	<b>61%</b>
2008-2009 Target	<b>61%</b>
2009-2010 Target	<b>61%</b>
2010-2011 Target	<b>71%</b>
2011-2012 Target	<b>81%</b>
2012-2013 Target	<b>90%</b>
2013-2014 Target	<b>100%</b>

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Performance Indicator 1.3

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and performance targets for the percentage of Title I schools that make adequate yearly progress. For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of Title I schools that made adequate yearly progress in the 2001-2002 school year, based upon the 2001-2002 school year test administration. For performance targets, please indicate the percentage of Title I schools that will make adequate yearly progress from the 2002-2003 school year through the 2013-2014 school year.

<b>Baseline Data and Targets</b>	<b>Percentage of Title I Schools Making Adequate Yearly Progress</b>
2001-2002 Baseline	<b>72.4</b>
2002-2003 Target	<b>74.4</b>
2003-2004 Target	<b>76.4</b>
2004-2005 Target	<b>78.4</b>
2005-2006 Target	<b>80.4</b>
2006-2007 Target	<b>82.4</b>
2007-2008 Target	<b>84.4</b>
2008-2009 Target	<b>86.4</b>
2009-2010 Target	<b>88.4</b>
2010-2011 Target	<b>91</b>
2011-2012 Target	<b>94</b>
2012-2013 Target	<b>97</b>
2013-2014 Target	<b>100</b>

**2. Baseline data and performance targets for any State identified goals and indicators**

If your State included any State identified goals and indicators in its June 2002 consolidated State application submission, please provide baseline data and performance targets for those goals and indicators below.

<b>BASELINE DATA AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS FOR STATE IDENTIFIED GOALS AND INDICATORS</b>
Not applicable

**B. STATE ACTIVITIES TO IMPLEMENT ESEA PROGRAMS**

**1a. Please provide evidence that the State has:**

- adopted challenging content standards in reading/language arts and mathematics at each grade level for grades 3 through 8, consistent with section 1111(b)(1); or
- disseminated grade-level expectations for reading/language arts and mathematics for grades 3 through 8 to LEAs and schools if the State's academic content standards cover more than one grade level.

**STATE RESPONSE**

The State of Michigan developed and adopted content standards in reading/language arts and mathematics by grade clusters in 1995 as part of the Michigan Curriculum Framework. To comply with the requirements of No Child Left Behind, Section 1111(b)(1) for standards in grades 3 through 8, the Department of Treasury, Michigan Educational Assessment Program, in collaboration with the Michigan Department of Education, Office of School Excellence, and representatives from local districts developed grade level content expectations in both of these content areas. They were presented to the State Board of Education for their review in December 2002 and in April 2003 were disseminated to schools on the web. The English Language Arts grade level expectations may be viewed at:

<http://www.meritaward.state.mi.us/mma/meapinfo/ELAContentExpectationsApr04.pdf>

The mathematics grade level expectations may be viewed at:

[http://www.meritaward.state.mi.us/mma/meapinfo/MATHContentExpectations4\\_18\\_03.pdf](http://www.meritaward.state.mi.us/mma/meapinfo/MATHContentExpectations4_18_03.pdf)

**1b. Please provide a detailed timeline for major milestones for adopting challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).**

**STATE RESPONSE**

The State of Michigan developed science standards in the late 1980s and revised them to align with the national standards in the mid 1990s. They became a part of the Michigan Curriculum Framework in 1995. The standards and benchmarks may be viewed at: [http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6525\\_6530\\_6568-19448--,00.html](http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6525_6530_6568-19448--,00.html)



**1c. Please provide a detailed timeline of major milestones for the development and implementation, in consultation with LEAs, of assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels.**

**STATE RESPONSE**

**Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts**

<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP)  (Michigan Department of Treasury)</b>	<b>Michigan's Alternate Assessment Program (MI-Access)  (Michigan Department of Education)</b>
<b>Summer 2002</b>	<p>Develop Grade Level Content Expectations: Phase I</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Teams of teachers and other educators from the field reviewed K-8 benchmark alignment information received from over 90 local districts in the State.</li> <li>•Recording of this information for mathematics and English Language Arts formed the basis for development of Grade Level Content Expectations in both subject areas.</li> <li>•First drafts were reviewed at regional meetings throughout the state with representatives of interested districts, schools and other persons. Results formulated input for Phase II of the development process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•MI-Access has a contract with Beck Evaluation and Testing Associates, Inc. (BETA) to assist MI-Access in the implementation of the current Phase 1 MI-Access assessments for students with severe and moderate cognitive impairments.</li> </ul> <p>BETA also has the contract to assist in the development of the Phase 2 proposed assessment plans or blueprints for assessing students with mild cognitive impairments in the content areas of English language arts, mathematics and career &amp; employability skills. The Phase 2 assessments are being developed for grades 3–8 and grade 11.</p> <p>The subject area of science will be developed for both MI-Access Phase 1 and 2 students.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•State Board of Education Approved the performance standards cut scores for the MI-Access performance categories of Surpassed, Attained and Emerging toward the Performance Standards.</li> </ul>
<b>Fall 2002</b>	<p>Develop Grade Level Content Expectations: Phase II</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Modified drafts from Phase I are placed on a special website for a second round of input from the public.</li> <li>•Recommendations from this review are submitted to an academic review (e.g., content area organizations, universities).</li> </ul>	

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION MAY 1, 2003, SUBMISSION

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modifications are made to produce final draft for State Board of Education and the Department of Treasury.</li> </ul>	
<b>Winter and Spring 2003</b>	<p>Develop Grade Level Content Expectations: Phase III</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Department of Treasury approves final draft; State Board of Education receives final draft.</li> <li>• Documents are reformatted for dissemination via the web.</li> <li>• Final version is prepared for submission to USED on June 1, 2003.</li> </ul>	<p>Statewide Implementation of MI-Access Phase 1 Participation and Supported Independence assessments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Grades 4, 5, 7, 8 and 11 assessments are completed.</li> <li>▪ Begin to Develop assessment activities for grades 3 and 6.</li> <li>▪ Complete Proposed Phase 2.1 Assessment Plan and item specifications.</li> <li>▪ Disseminate Proposed Assessment Plan for Field Review by online survey.</li> </ul> <p>Students Eligible for MI-Access Phase 2 assessments were assessed by what the IEP Team determined as the appropriate assessment until the MI-Access Phase 2 assessments ready for statewide implementation.</p>
<b>Winter and Spring 2003</b>	<p>Newly selected test development contractor works with state to finalize design of new MEAP assessments for grades 3-8 according to NCLB requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Content is based on final draft of Grade Level Content Expectations.</li> <li>• Blueprints are developed and test item development begins.</li> </ul> <p>Development includes new tests to cover those grade levels not currently part of the MEAP, such as grades 3 and 6, and modifications to existing MEAP tests that are administered in grades 4, 5, 7, 8 and 11. This is necessary because the content of current MEAP tests cover more than one grade level and results are based on different scales. Testing at every grade, 3-8 will allow content to be assessed that is more specific to each grade level. The new design is intended to put all 3-8 tests on one vertical scale so that measures of annual academic growth may be determined.</p> <p>Annual Yearly Progress of base year assessments (2002) continue to be administered and include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading/English Language Arts in grades 4, 7, and 11</li> <li>• Mathematics in grades 4, 8, and 11</li> </ul>	<p><b>Spring 2003</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MI-Access Phase 2.1 proposed assessment plan completed <i>and</i> disseminated for field review and comment.</li> </ul> <p>One of the components of the assessment plan is the extended benchmarks/grade level content expectations that are appropriate for students with cognitive impairment. The MEAP grade level content expectations were used as a foundation for this process.</p>

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION MAY 1, 2003, SUBMISSION

	<p>Implement Accommodated MEAP test designed for Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students in grades 4 and 7.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Use expanded accommodations that are approved by Merit Board in the Department of Treasury.</li> </ul> <p>Implement High School Testing with expanded accommodations for LEP students.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Track selected accommodation used for each student.</li> <li>•Track each student's primary language.</li> </ul>	
<b>Spring and Summer 2003</b>	<p>Convene Content Advisory Committees (CAC) to review item specifications and draft items based on grade level content expectations and test blueprints. Modifications may be made as a result of this process.</p> <p>Set standards for accommodated form of MEAP test that was used with LEP students, utilizing process that relates standard-setting to the corresponding MEAP test. Review assessment results for LEP students with assessment advisory committees. Analyze technical merit of accommodated tests for grades 4 and 7.</p> <p>Review results of using MEAP with extended accommodations at the high school level. Determine final accommodation approach for use with LEP students for the 2003-04 school year.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Locate and committee review of reading passages for the MI-Access 2.1 ELA assessment</li> <li>•MI-Access Phase 2.1 item writing will take place in the content areas of English language arts, mathematics, and career &amp; employability skills.</li> </ul>
<b>School Year 2003-04</b>	<p>Conduct field test with English Language Proficiency test developed with the CCSO SCASS consortium (scheduled for fall).</p> <p>Implement full pilot testing for grade levels not previously tested with MEAP is initiated according to piloting selection that is approved with the Assessment Advisory Committee (AAC), Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), Department of Treasury and the State Board of Education. Schools and district selected will reflect the geographic and demographic diversity of the State. Existing MEAP assessments are modified and expanded to reflect new content and design requirements.</p>	<p><b>Fall 2003</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Compilation and analysis of field review comments on the proposed assessment plan for the Phase 2.1 MI-Access assessments will be completed. The MI-Access Phase 2 Content Advisory Committee (CAC), the Sensitivity Review Committee (SRC), Alternate Assessment Advisory Committee (AAAC), and the MI-Access Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) will review comments. Revisions to the Phase 2 assessment plan, as needed, will be done.</li> <li>•Assessment Plan to SBE tentatively scheduled for October</li> <li>•CAC, SRC, and TAC review of Phase 2.1 assessment items. Revise items, as needed..</li> </ul>

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION MAY 1, 2003, SUBMISSION

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Begin the development of the MI-Access Phase 2.2 Proposed Assessment Plan and item specifications by MDE and advisory committees</li> </ul> <p><b>Winter 2004</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Disseminate the Proposed 2.2 assessment plan for field review by online survey.</li> <li>•Phase 2.2 item writing begins</li> </ul>
<b>Spring 2004</b>	<p>Review results of the MEAP pilot testing and make modifications as recommended by AAC, CAC, TAC, and results of educational staff surveys.</p> <p>Determine recommendations and schedule for final selection and implementation of an English Language Proficiency test to be used statewide.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Phase 2.1 Item Tryouts</li> <li>•Complete development of Phase 1 assessment activities for grades 3 and 6.</li> <li>•CAC, SRC, TAC review of Phase 1 grades 3 and 6 assessment items. Revise items, as needed.</li> <li>•Field Review of the Proposed 2.2 Assessment Plan completed.</li> </ul>
<b>Summer 2004</b>	<p>Use Spring modifications to develop final versions for grade 3-8 and high school level tests for implementation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•MDE and Advisory Committees review feedback from the Phase 2.2 proposed plan field review. Revise, as needed.</li> <li>•CAC, SRC and TAC review of Phase 2.1 Tryout data. Revise items, as needed.</li> <li>•CAC, SRC and TAC review of Phase 2.2 items. Revise items, as needed.</li> </ul>
<b>School Year 2004-05</b>	<p>Design the mathematics and reading/language arts tests to meet NCLB requirements are administered for the first time to all students in grades 3-8 and once at the high school level.</p>	<p><b>Winter 2005</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Grades 3-8 and 11 Phase 1 implementation</li> </ul> <p><b>Spring 2005</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Phase 2.1 Pilot</li> <li>•Phase 2.2 Item Tryout</li> <li>•Performance Standard Setting for Phase 1 grades 3-8 and 11</li> </ul>

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION MAY 1, 2003, SUBMISSION

<b>Spring 2006</b>		MI-Access Phase 2.2 item pilot
<b>Summer 2006</b>		CAC, SRC, and TAC review of Phase 2.2 pilot data. Revise items, as needed.
<b>Winter 2006</b>		MI-Access Grades 3-8 and 11 Phase 2.1 implemented statewide.
<b>Winter 2007</b>		•MI-Access in completely implemented (Grades 3-8 and 11 for Phase 1, 2.1, and 2.2)
<b>SCIENCE TIMELINE</b>	<b>Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP)</b>	<b>MI-Access Michigan's Alternate Assessment Program</b>
<b>Winter 2004</b>		Begin development of the proposed MI-Access Science assessment plan
<b>Summer 2004</b>	The MEAP currently has science assessments in place for grades 5, 8 and 11. These tests are based on K-12 content standards that are part of the Michigan Curriculum Framework. Assessment blueprints are based on benchmarks that are targeted to grade-level clusters, such as late elementary, etc. MEAP plans on maintaining these assessments at the specified grade levels, expand levels of difficulty, and modify design to be consistent with other MEAP tests, grades 3-8.	Begin MI-Access Science assessment item writing.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION MAY 1, 2003, SUBMISSION

<b>Fall 2004</b>		Disseminate MI-Access Science assessment plan for field review and comment.
<b>Winter 2005</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Compile and review comments from field review on the Proposed MI-Access science assessment plan.</li> <li>•CAC, SRC, and TAC review of the science items. Revise as needed.</li> </ul>
<b>Spring 2005</b>		Science Assessment plan to the SBE.
<b>Spring 2006</b>		•MI-Access grades 5, 8 and 11 science item tryout
<b>Summer 2006</b>		CAC, SRC, and TAC review of MI-Access Science item tryout data. Revise items, as needed.
<b>Spring 2007</b>		•MI-Access grades 5, 8 and 11 science pilot
<b>Summer 2007</b>		CAC, SRC, and TAC review of MI-Access Science pilot data. Revise items, as needed.
<b>Winter 2008</b>		MI-Access Science implemented statewide in grades 5, 8 and 11.

**1d. Please provide a detailed timeline for major milestones for setting, in consultation with LEAs, academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).**

**STATE RESPONSE**

**Timeline of major milestones in developing and implementing academic achievement standards**

Timeline	Michigan System of Assessments	MI-Access, Michigan's Alternate Assessment Program
<b>Spring/Summer 2002</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MI-Access currently has 3 levels of academic achievement standards that describe student performance on the Phase 1 MI-Access assessments (Participation and Supported Independence). Standard setting took place during spring 2002 and the State Board of Education approved the cut scores and the achievement categories August 2002. The process used and the definitions of each of the categories are described in the MI-Access Handbook (this is available upon request)The three levels are described below.</li> <li>• Surpassed the Performance Expectation</li> <li>• Attained the Performance Expectation</li> <li>• Emerging Toward the Performance Expectation</li> </ul>
<b>Winter 2003</b>	<p>The MEAP currently has 4 levels of academic achievement standards that describe performance on all MEAP tests. The four performance levels are listed below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- The student has “exceeded” Michigan performance standards.</li> <li>2- The student has “met” Michigan performance standards.</li> <li>3- The student has a “basic” performance level in the subject.</li> <li>4- The student has achieved an “apprentice” level demonstrating little success in the subject.</li> </ol> <p>Standards are set for each test using a bookmarking approach with input from educators, business, and community members. Articulation involving participants ensures recommendations for setting cut points that are comparable from one grade level to another.</p>	<p><b>Spring 2005</b> Standard setting for grades 3-8 and 11 Phase 1 assessments</p> <p><b>Spring 2006</b> Standard setting for grades 3-8 and 11 Phase 2.1 assessments</p> <p><b>Spring 2007</b> Standard setting for grades 3-8 and 11 Phase 2.2 assessments</p> <p><b>Spring 2008</b> Standard setting for grades 5, 8 and 11 MI-Access science assessments.</p>
<b>Spring and Summer 2003</b>	<p>Assessment Advisory Committees complete recommendations for setting standards with new MEAP assessments for grades 3-8 and high school that make use of standards for existing MEAP tests to assist in establishing standards for expanded versions and standards setting for new grade level</p>	



